

The Journal of Theological Studies

JULY, 1934

NOTES AND STUDIES

THE DIDACHE¹

PART I

THE Didache or Teaching of the Apostles, as it is commonly called, is the work of a writer whose name has not come down to us. The full title of his work tells us what he wishes it to be taken as being—'The Teaching of the Lord, through the Twelve Apostles, to the Gentiles.' This remarkable title he no doubt composed with the last verses of St Matthew's Gospel before him: 'Go ye therefore and instruct all the Gentiles (τὰ ἔθνη), baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.' We find echoes of this verse later, in such a phrase as 'the second command of the Teaching', and again in the words, 'Having first said all these things, baptize ye in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.'

Though the book was called in early times quite briefly 'The Teaching of the Apostles', the author's own claim is to have put on record what the Apostles had handed down as that teaching of the Lord which, in His parting words, He had bidden them give to the Gentiles to whom He was sending them. Writers of the post-apostolic age who professed to present to their readers our Lord's unrecorded teachings sought to commend their inventions by describing a scene in which Christ conversed with His disciples after the Resurrection; or else they boldly attributed their work to an Apostle or a disciple of the Apostles. Our author adopts no such pretence. He prefers to remain in the background, and he is content to let his work stand on its own merits: it is 'The Teaching of the Lord, through the Twelve Apostles, to the Gentiles'. And so without further preface he proceeds: 'Two ways there are, one of life and one of death; and there is a great difference between the two ways.'

¹ By the late Dr Armitage Robinson. See *supra* pp. 113-146. Footnotes in square brackets, with the initials 'R. H. C.', are by Dom Connolly. Dr Robinson, however, was mistaken in supposing that the book *Barnabas, Hermas, and the Didache* was out of print (*supra* pp. 115, 119). It may still be had from the S.P.C.K.

Such a beginning had the advantage of recalling our Lord's own manner of teaching: for had He not spoken of a narrow way which leadeth unto life, and a broad way that leadeth unto destruction? But more: were not these opening words, with but slight modifications, the actual words of an Apostle? For, as we have seen above, the Epistle of Barnabas was in early days believed to have been written by the Apostle of that name who accompanied St Paul on his first mission to the Gentiles; and the concluding section of that Epistle opened thus: 'Two ways there are of teaching and power, that of light and that of darkness; and there is a great difference in the two ways.' Barnabas indeed goes on to explain wherein the 'great difference' consists: 'For on the one are stationed light-giving angels of God, but on the other angels of Satan: and the one is Lord from eternity and unto eternity, but the other is ruler of the time of iniquity that now is.'

But the Didachist—if I may be allowed for brevity's sake the use of the term—has no intention of merely copying the words of a particular Apostle: it is enough that what he writes should be such as Apostles might very well have said. He has changed 'the way of light' and 'the way of darkness' into 'the way of life' and 'the way of death'; probably with the words of Jeremiah in his mind: 'Thus saith the Lord: Behold, I set before you the way of life and the way of death.' Then he omits altogether the explanation of the 'great difference between the two ways', and so leaves the sentence which asserts it in the air. He does not follow Barnabas in his mention of spiritual agents of good and evil. Nowhere indeed in his book does he speak of either angel or devil; though such a silence is almost, if not quite, unique in the early Christian writers.

It will conduce to clearness if after these introductory remarks we follow the method adopted for the latter part of the Epistle of Barnabas, and give a literal translation of the Greek text interspersed with comments.

The Teaching of the Lord through the Twelve Apostles to the Gentiles.

Two ways there are, one of life and one of death; and there is a great difference between the two ways. The way of life then is this. First, thou shalt love the God that made thee: secondly, thy neighbour as thyself; and all things whatsoever thou wouldest have not done to thee, do not thou to another.

Now Barnabas had said: 'The way of light then is this'; and had gone on (after the sentences about angels of God and Satan which the Didachist prefers to drop): 'Thou shalt love Him that made thee, thou shalt fear Him that formed thee, thou shalt glorify Him that redeemed thee from death'; and much later he had said: 'Thou shalt love thy

neighbour more than thine own soul.' Such exuberance of language and warmth of emotion does not commend itself to the Didachist, who has a good deal to add to what Barnabas has said, and who is moreover desirous of getting his precepts into a more systematic order. So he cuts down the flowing rhetoric, and keeping only the phrase 'that made thee' remodels on the lines of the First and Second Commandments of the Gospel, writing as follows: 'First, thou shalt love the God that made thee: secondly, thy neighbour as thyself.' Then he compensates for this excessive brevity by adding, but in a negative form, the Golden Rule of the Sermon on the Mount. This negative precept was in substance pre-Christian, being found for example in Tobit iv 15: 'What thou hatest, do to no man.' It occurs again and again in early Christian writings, with verbal modification due to a recollection of the Golden Rule itself, but nowhere is it made to conform so closely as in the Didache to the particular wording of that Rule which we meet with in the Gospel of St Matthew.

Mt. vii 12

But if the Didachist plainly had St Matthew's words before him, why should he perversely change the Golden Rule from the positive to the negative form? I believe that examination will shew that, so far from acting from perversity, he is in fact following the line that he has marked out for himself in the carefully chosen words of his title. I will even go so far as to suggest that in this very change we may find the clue to his purpose and method in the opening section of his work.

The commandment 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself' was declared by our Lord to be 'the second in the law'. But the original precept which he thus reaffirmed was by its very context limited in application to a brother Israelite; for it ran: 'Thou shalt not be wroth with the sons of thy people, but thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.'¹⁸ And that such was the interpretation put upon it in our Lord's own day is only too plain from St Matthew's words: 'It was said to them of old time, Thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy.' Our Lord was giving a new meaning to the word 'neighbour', when He cancelled this ancient gloss with the amazing paradox, 'But I say unto you, Love your enemies'. It was a hard saying then. It is a hard saying to-day, after nineteen centuries of Christian effort and experience. It was just the hardness of this and other seemingly extravagant requirements of the Sermon on the Mount—more especially when presented as the Lord's teaching to the Gentiles—that forced the writer of the Didache to face the question whether the Apostles in carrying out their commission did as a matter of fact insist on a strict and literal obedience to the severer demands of the Christian law.

Mt. xxii

37-39

Lev. xix

18

Mt. v 43 f.

Now in St Luke's account this new requirement is followed by a group of illustrative precepts which, so far from rendering it more reasonable,

Lc. vi 27-30 seem only to enhance its impracticability: 'But I say unto you which hear: Love your enemies, do good to them which hate you, bless them that curse you, and pray for them which despitefully use you. And unto him that smiteth thee on the one cheek offer also the other; and him that taketh away thy cloke forbid not to take thy coat also: give to every man that asketh of thee, and of him that taketh away thy goods ask them not again.' Then, as if to aggravate the difficulty of obedience, these instances are gathered up into a general rule of conduct covering every act of human intercourse: 'And as ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise.'

St Matthew has the same series of precepts in almost the same language, though he has them distributed so as to form contrasts with the maxims of the earlier law: and somewhat later he will give us the all-embracing rule of action, stated in terms yet more emphatic:

Mt. vii 12 'Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets.'

As the Gospel message passed from East to West the question to which we have referred must inevitably have arisen: to what extent should the seemingly impracticable demands of the Sermon on the Mount be insisted on as of universal obligation? Could it be that the most exacting rule of all was to be presented as an indispensable part of the Teaching of the Lord through the Twelve Apostles to the Gentiles?

Tobit iv 15 'What thou hatest, do to no man' was a Jewish maxim which might seem of less stringent implication: indeed such Greek philosophers as the Stoics could say *Quod tibi fieri non vis, alteri ne feceris*. And, be the reason what it may, it is in this negative form that the Didachist has chosen to present us with the Golden Rule. For he writes: 'All things whatsoever thou wouldest have *not* done to thee, do *not* thou to another.'

But what possible justification could he have found in the Apostolic writings for so daring a substitution? Happily the answer is not far to seek.

The Apostolic Decree relating to the admission of the Gentiles has in recent times been the subject of a striking dissertation by Gotthold Resch, the son of the veteran compiler of the 'Agrapha' or Unwritten Sayings of our Lord.¹ Whether we are convinced or not by his powerful pleading for the originality of the 'Western' text in this particular passage of the Acts of the Apostles, we must at any rate recognize that this extra-canonical text, as he calls it, had a very early and wide circulation. The essential point of difference between the canonical text and the extra-canonical is this—that the former is in the main a regulation as to

Acts xv
20, 29

¹ *Das Aposteldecree nach seiner ausserkanonischen Textgestalt*, 1905 (Texte u. Untersuch. xxviii—N. F. xiii—No. 3).

food, whereas the latter is concerned only with moral prohibitions. 'It Acts xv 29 seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things : that ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication : from which if ye keep yourselves ye shall do well.' Such is the accepted text, attested by all the great Greek manuscripts save one. But Codex Bezae with strong support from early Fathers reads : 'that ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from fornication : and whatsoever things ye would not have done to yourselves, not to do to another ; from which keeping yourselves do ye well, being carried forward by the Holy Ghost.'¹ In like manner at an earlier point, instead of 'that they abstain from pollutions of idols, and from fornication, and from things strangled, and from blood', Acts xv 20 Codex Bezae has 'from pollutions of idols, and from fornication, and from blood ; and whatsoever they would not have done to themselves, do not to others'. The earliest fathers interpreted blood in the sense of homicide, and did not suppose that the Apostles had laid down any law of food ; they simply forbade idolatry, fornication, and murder. But we must leave this interesting problem and return to the Didache.

We may be confident that the text of the Acts which our author used contained twice over the negative form of the Golden Rule. Here he Acts xv 20, found the teaching given by the Apostles on a solemn occasion as sum-²⁹ming up those necessary prohibitions which the Gentile converts must by all means accept.² This was emphatically a part of 'the Teaching of the Lord through the Twelve Apostles to the Gentiles'. Whatever, therefore, the Didachist's motive for his addition may have been, no words could be more appropriately added, if any addition were required, to the two great commandments of the Gospel. So he writes : 'First, thou shalt love the God that made thee : secondly, thy neighbour as thyself ; and all things whatsoever thou wouldest have not done to thee, do not thou to another.'

He has made slight changes in the wording, sufficient to shew that he is no mere copyist. He has prefixed the phrase 'all things', and he has, contrary to Greek idiom, put the negative after instead of before the verb. The text of Codex Bezae in Acts xv 29 runs : *Καὶ ὅσα μὴ θέλετε ἐαντοῖς γίνεσθαι, ἐτέρῳ μὴ ποιῆν*. But the Didachist writes : *Πάντα δὲ ὅσα ἐὰν θελήσῃς μὴ γίνεσθαι σοι, καὶ σὺ ἄλλῳ μὴ ποίει*. The explanation is found when we look at the Golden Rule in Mt. vii 12,

¹ With the phrase *φερόμενοι ἐν τῷ ἀγαθῷ πνεύματι* cf. 2 Pet. i 21, *ἐκὸ πνεύματος ἀγίου φερόμενοι*.

² [It is perhaps worth while to recall that the Didascalia—the second 'Teaching' of the Apostles—pretends to have been written immediately after the Conference at Jerusalem.—R. H. C.]

which runs: Πάντα οὖν ὅσα ἐὰν θέλητε ἵνα ποιῶσιν ὑμῖν οἱ ἄνθρωποι, οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιεῖτε αὐτοῖς.¹

We see at once where the changes have come from; he has conformed the negative rule which he found in the Acts of the Apostles so far as was possible to the wording of the positive rule in the Sermon on the Mount. His having done so has a further interest when we observe that he immediately passes on to give us a series of interpretative precepts which are derived from the Sermon itself.

The new section is introduced thus: 'Now of these words the teaching is this.' Barnabas had written, very characteristically, concerning 'the way of light': 'The *gnosis* then which has been given to us to walk therein is as follows: Thou shalt love Him that made thee', and so on. This is plain enough; for Barnabas had begun with his little parable of the two ways and the two kinds of angels, and what could be more natural than that he should go on to give us its interpretation—the *gnosis* of it? But the corresponding clause in the Didache is less clear. What is meant by 'these words' of which we need to be told 'the teaching'? and why 'the teaching' (*τὴν διδαχὴν*) and not 'the interpretation'?²

What the Didachist actually proceeds to give us is a series of commands taken over from the Sermon on the Mount, the language of St Matthew being skilfully blended with that of St Luke, and the sentences so recast as to avoid exact quotation from either Evangelist. Moreover, he has introduced some modifications and additions, which add yet further to the appearance of independence.

Now it is to be noted that the group of precepts which he begins with is that particular group in St Luke which we had occasion to quote in full above (pp. 227–228)—the group which ends with the Golden Rule. But this rule the Didachist has just given in the negative form, in which he had found it laid down by the Apostles for Gentile believers. He has departed from the arrangement in St Luke to the extent that he has chosen to employ the rule rather as an introduction to this challenging group of precepts than as its climax. Accordingly it is of 'these words'—that is to say of this great rule, challenging still in its less

¹ It is interesting to find that the *Epitome* (or 'Apostolic Church Order') in reproducing this sentence of the Didache gives the natural order of the Greek construction, πάντα δὲ ὅσα ἂν μὴ θέλῃς. So too in the Apostolic Constitutions (vii 2) we read: πάν τιν δ μὴ θέλεις.

² The Latin version actually has 'interpretatio'. It is interesting to read in the *Epitome* (or 'Apostolical Church Order'), where parts are assigned to each Apostle: 'Matthew said, All things whatsoever thou wouldst not have done to thee, neither do thou to another. Now of these words the teaching do thou tell, brother Peter.' Here at least no doubt was felt as to what was meant by 'these words'.

exacting form—that he undertakes to set out ‘the teaching’ (τὴν διδαχὴν), that is—if we may venture to interpret the word here by his own use of it in the title of his book—the Teaching of the Lord as conveyed to the Gentiles through His Apostles.

Now of these words the teaching is this: Bless them that curse you, i 3 and pray for your enemies, and fast for them that persecute you. For what thank is it if ye love them that love you? Do not even the Gentiles the same? But love ye them that hate you, and ye shall not have an enemy.

The change of St Matthew’s ‘Love your enemies, and pray for them Mt. v 44 that persecute you’ into ‘Pray for your enemies, and fast for them that persecute you’, can hardly be due to a mere desire for variation. We have here our first example of the Didachist’s curious fondness for dropping a hint beforehand of a topic which he will treat later on. Now in St Matthew’s Gospel the whole series of commands with which we are concerned is closed by the words: ‘Ye therefore shall be perfect, as v 48 your heavenly Father is perfect’, and then follows without a break the teaching of our Lord as to Almsgiving, Prayer, and Fasting. Each of these duties will be treated by the Didachist further on, and the mention of Fasting at this point serves as an indication that this as well as Prayer and Almsgiving will receive the attention which is its due.¹

To the immediate context in the Sermon on the Mount we may likewise ascribe the Didachist’s further supplement: ‘and ye shall not have an enemy’. Here it is St Luke’s version that is being the more closely followed. The Evangelist’s words are: ‘If ye love them that love you, Lc. vi 32, what thank have ye? . . . But love your enemies . . . and your reward 35 shall be great, and ye shall be sons of the Most High.’ A few verses earlier the same Evangelist had said: ‘Love your enemies, do well to Lc. vi 27 them that hate you.’ It is with these thoughts and words in his mind that the Didachist writes: ‘For what thank is it if ye love them that love you? . . . But love ye them that hate you, and ye shall not have an enemy.’ Thus he defines in a more practical way what the ‘thank’ or ‘reward’ will be.

Abstain from the fleshly and bodily desires. If any man give thee a i 4 blow on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also, and thou shalt be perfect; if a man impress thee to go with him one mile, go with him

¹ In c. viii we shall find the rule laid down that Wednesday and Friday are to be the days of fasting, and not the Monday and Thursday of the Jews. For a supposed command of our Lord to His disciples to fast for the unbelieving Jews see article by Dom Connolly on ‘The use of the Didache in the Didascalia’, *J.T.S.* xxiv pp. 51–2. It is difficult not to believe that some early *apocryphon* lies behind this tradition and may have been within the Didachist’s knowledge.

twain ; if a man take away thy cloke, give him thy coat also ; if a man take from thee that which is thine, ask it not back ; for neither art thou able.

This second group of precepts is likewise from the Sermon on the Mount ; but in the Didache it is preceded by an exhortation which comes from another source and seems strangely out of place at this point : ' Abstain (thou) from the fleshly and bodily desires.' In 1 Pet. ii 11 we read : ' Abstain (ye)¹ from the fleshly desires, which war against the soul.' The Didachist's addition ' and bodily' (καὶ σωματικῶν) was perhaps intended to give more substance to his abbreviated sentence ; and, if so, the choice of the epithet ' *bodily*' may well have been suggested by the phrase ' against the *soul*' which was being dropped ; for it was natural to contrast body with soul, whereas flesh is the counterpart of spirit.

After this we have again a conflation of St Matthew and St Luke. The construction δόναι ῥάπισμα (to give a blow), familiar as it is in English, would appear to be exceedingly rare in Greek : it is therefore Jo. xviii 22, worthy of note that it occurs twice in St John's Gospel (ἔδωκε ῥάπισμα
xix 3 τῷ Ἰησοῦ, and ἐδίδουσαν αὐτῷ ῥάπισματα).

And now we have another striking supplement—' and thou shalt be perfect'. We have already noted that in St Matthew's Gospel, at the close of the whole series of what have always been accounted the most exacting of our Lord's commands in the Sermon on the Mount, we find Mt. v 48 the words, ' Ye therefore shall be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect'. Taking his cue from this saying the Didachist writes : ' If a man give thee a blow on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also, *and thou shalt be perfect.*' He thus mitigates the seeming extravagance of the command by presenting it as ' a counsel of perfection'. Similarly we shall find him at a later point appending to his whole exposition of moral duties the general statement : ' If thou art able to bear the whole yoke of the Lord, thou shalt be perfect ; but if thou art not able, what thou art able that do'. vi 2

Yet another supplement meets us at the end of this second group of precepts : ' If a man take away from thee that which is thine, ask it not back, *for neither art thou able.*' Of this addition no satisfactory explanation seems to have been offered. It has a special interest when we regard it as pointing forward to the general statement just quoted, where its phrasing is so emphatically repeated ; for it affords another indication of unity of authorship in the earlier and later parts of the treatise.

To every one that asketh of thee give, and ask not back ; for to all i 5-6 the Father desireth that there be given of His own gifts. Blessed is he

¹ [ἀνέχεσθε, for ἀνέχεσθαι, is a well-supported reading. Dr Robinson had a note to this effect, which, however, does not appear in the final form of his manuscript.—R. H. C.]

that giveth according to the commandment ; for he is guiltless. Woe to him that receiveth ; for if a man receive having need, he shall be guiltless : but he that hath no need shall give satisfaction why and wherefore he received ; and being put in confinement he shall be examined concerning the things which he hath done, and he shall not come out thence until he pay the uttermost farthing. But indeed concerning this it hath been said : Let thine alms sweat into thy hands, until thou know to whom thou givest.

In the passage immediately preceding the Didachist had written : ' If a man take from thee that which is thine, ask (it) not back ; for neither art thou able.' The last words are his own ; but the rest are with some modification from Lc. vi 30, of which the full text is : ' To every one that asketh of thee give ; and from him that taketh away the things that are thine, ask (them) not back.' Of this he had omitted the first clause, ' To every man that asketh of thee give', apparently because he had another use for it. He had not yet come to the subject of Almsgiving ; but he was about to treat of it almost at once, and he intended to use this clause as an introduction to the new topic. In postponing the clause he made no departure from the spirit of the Gospel text ; for from the second part of St Luke's sentence it is plain that the giving enjoined in the first part is not giving in alms, of which indeed he makes no mention at all in his account of the Sermon on the Mount. If we look at the context in St Luke we shall see that each of the commands prescribes the way in which an act of violence or an unreasonable demand is to be met.

But the Didachist knows of another striking passage on the subject of Giving, contained in a work which perhaps already in his day enjoyed a wide popularity. Of this passage he proposes to make considerable use, although the Giving which it contemplates does not (as in the Gospel passage of which he has just made use) involve submission to harsh treatment or unreasonable demand, but is the free, benevolent, and indiscriminating bestowal of alms upon all who are in want, whether they are worthy or unworthy and whether they ask or not. In order to introduce this passage he now picks up the first clause of St Luke, which he had intentionally passed over, and writes : ' To every one that asketh of thee give', adding the words of which he had already made use, ' and ask not back'.

At the very outset of his work the Didachist left Barnabas somewhat abruptly for the Sermon on the Mount ; now he is leaving the Sermon on the Mount for the Shepherd of Hermas. Here we must recall what we said above of the Second Mandate of the Shepherd.¹ In enjoining

¹ [The chapter on Hermas which was to have preceded this one on the Didache, as in the original book, has not been revised : see for the treatment of Hermas here *Barnabas, Hermas and the Didache* pp. 33-34.—R. H. C.]

Jas. i 5
Herm. M.
ii 4 ff.

what he called 'simplicity' (*ἀπλότητα*) in giving, Hermas had started not from the Sermon on the Mount, but from the words of St James which speak of God as 'giving to all simply (*ἀπλῶς*)', that is to say unconditionally. 'Give to all that are in want simply (*ἀπλῶς*)', says Hermas; and again: 'Give to all; for to all God desireth that there be given of His own gifts (*δωρημάτων*).'¹ He goes on to say that the receivers will give account to God for what cause and to what end they receive. Those who receive because they are in need will not be punished; but those who receive in hypocrisy will pay the penalty. So the giver is not responsible; he, in any case, is 'guiltless'. For the giver had received of the Lord a ministration to fulfil, and he fulfilled it 'simply', not doubting to whom he should give or not give.² Here the sequence of thought is perfect: Hermas knows what he wants to say and says it. He faces the problem of indiscriminating charity and finds his own solution.

How then does the Didachist treat the matter? He begins as we have seen with a precept compiled out of St Luke: 'To every one that asketh of thee give, and ask not back.' He does not use the words 'ask' and 'give' in the particular sense in which St Luke had used them—namely, of an oppressive demand and its acceptance without demur—but in the familiar sense of asking and giving in alms; for he wants his precept to lead on to the discussion of almsgiving in the Shepherd of Hermas. He then appends to the precept a reason taken directly out of Hermas, who had said: 'Give to all that are in want simply'. 'Give to all; for to all God desireth that there should be given of His own gifts (*δωρημάτων*): that is to say, Follow the example of 'God who giveth to all simply and upbraideth not': His will is that men who enjoy His bountiful gifts (for this is the meaning of the word *δωρημάτων* which he has borrowed from St James) should, out of these gifts, give to all without distinction. But the Didachist has no intention of following Hermas in upholding indiscriminate charity, although he will borrow his language. What he prefers to say is this: 'To every one that asketh of thee give, and ask not back; for to all the Father desireth that there be given of His own gifts (*χαρισμάτων*).'³ In such a context the reason does not fit the precept. Hermas has nothing at all about 'asking' or

¹ The two verses of St James (i 5, 17) from which Hermas borrows are rendered in the A.V.: 'If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, who giveth to all men liberally (*ἀπλῶς*) and upbraideth not'; and: 'Every good gift (*δόςαι*) and every perfect gift (*δῶρημα*) is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights.'

² [For similar ideas and language, cf. Hermas *Sim.* ii 7: *καὶ εἰργάσατο (ὁ πλούσιος) εἰς τὸν πένητα ἐκ τῶν δωρημάτων τοῦ κυρίου καὶ ἐτέλεσε τὴν διακονίαν τοῦ κυρίου ὀρθῶς.*—R. H. C.]

'asking back': his doctrine is that we must help all who need help, whether they come and ask or not; and therefore he can make his appeal to the example of 'God who giveth to all' without distinction. But, as we have said, the Didachist does not defend this broad view of almsgiving; and accordingly the reason which he has taken over from Hermas, who had founded it upon St James, does not fit the less inclusive precept which he has compiled for himself out of St Luke.

If the Didachist had any motive in the two verbal changes which he has made in the clause which he has borrowed from Hermas—apart from his apparent readiness to vary for variation's sake—we might possibly find it in a desire to dissociate himself from the phraseology of St James out of which that clause had been built. He has written 'the Father' in place of 'God' (Jas. i 5); and he has changed one word for a gift (*δώρημα*, Jas. i 17) into another (*χάρισμα*) which is almost peculiar to St Paul. The change to 'the Father' suggests that his thoughts are still running on the Sermon on the Mount (cf. Mt. v 45, vii 11). But the alteration of *δώρημα* 'bounty' into *χάρισμα* 'free gift' is more noticeable.

Philo insists more than once on the richness of meaning in *δωρεά*—he does not use *δώρημα*—and its cognates, as compared with *δόσις* and the other derivatives of *δίδωμι*.¹ This distinction is seen in the ascending scale in which St James writes: *Πᾶσα δόσις ἀγαθὴ καὶ πᾶν δώρημα τέλειον*. In the only other place in the New Testament where *δώρημα* occurs it chances to be followed by *χάρισμα* as an alternative;² and this passage may conceivably have suggested *χάρισμα* as an equivalent to *δώρημα* here. The word *χάρισμα* is hardly found outside the Biblical writings; but Philo has it once in the full rich sense of *δώρημα*,³ so that the Didachist was, as a matter of Greek, fully justified in his substitution. In the New Testament however *χάρισμα* is not used for any gift of material things. It is a purely Pauline word and stands for a special bestowal of God's *χάρις* on the Christian Society or any member of it—an endowment of grace for a particular purpose. Accordingly, while it is perfectly natural to speak of God's 'own bounties' as Hermas has done, it is somewhat startling to be told of 'His own endowments of grace' (*τῶν ἰδίων χαρισμάτων*): for it is men that have endowments of their own from God. There is just one passage in the New Testament in which the combination *ἴδιον χάρισμα* ('his own endowment of grace')

¹ Cf. J. B. Mayor Comm. on Ep. of St James, p. 53; and Ropes *ad loc.* (Internat. Crit. Comm.).

² Rom. v 16: 'And not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift (*δώρημα*): for the judgement was by one to condemnation, but the free gift (*χάρισμα*) is of many offences unto justification.'

³ Philo *Legum Alleg.* i p. 130 (ed. Cohn): *δωρεὰ γὰρ καὶ εὐεργεσία καὶ χάρισμα θεοῦ τὰ πάντα, κτλ.*

occurs. St Paul, in commending abstinence from marriage in the
 1 Cor. vii 7 present distress, says: 'I would that all men were even as I myself;
 but each man hath *his own gift* from God (ἐκαστος ἴδιον ἔχει χάρισμα ἐκ
 θεοῦ), one after this manner and another after that.' The frequent
 borrowings from the First Epistle to the Corinthians in the latter part of
 the Didache make it not unlikely that this very verse was in the author's
 mind. Whether this be so or not, it cannot reasonably be doubted that
 the passage as it stands in Hermas is original, and that as it stands in
 the Didache it is secondary.

So much has been written about *charismata* and 'charismatic
 ministries' in the fifty years that have passed since we recovered the
 Didache, and such strange theories have been based on the prominence
 which this treatise gives to Apostles, Prophets, and Teachers, whose
 functions are imagined to be peculiarly 'charismatic' as contrasted with
 those of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, that it is time to call attention
 to the fact that the Didachist himself never uses the word *χάρισμα* at all,
 except in this one passage where he employs it as a substitute for the
δώρημα of Hermas, and that even here he does not use it in the New
 Testament sense of an endowment of grace from God.

The Didachist proceeds: 'Blessed is he that giveth according to the
 commandment: for he is guiltless. Woe to him that receiveth.' We
 can hardly doubt that in constructing these sentences he is still
 influenced by the great Sermon as recorded by St Luke, where it begins
 with four blessings balanced immediately by four woes. But in the
 latter clause, 'Woe to him that receiveth', the desire for contrast has
 Lc. vi 20 ff. betrayed the writer into something like absurdity. Blessed are the
 poor; Woe to the rich—this contrast and those which follow in St Luke
 are paradoxical indeed, but full of spiritual meaning. The same cannot
 be said of the Didachist's antithesis: Blessed is the giver; Woe to the
 receiver. 'Woe to him that receiveth' is here set down as a maxim of
 universal import, on the same plane with 'Blessed is he that giveth'.
 But it will not do as such, and the writer is obliged at once to qualify it.

We must next observe that the writer says: 'Blessed is he that giveth
 according to the commandment' (κατὰ τὴν ἐντολήν). To what com-
 mandment does he refer? When we recall that this passage on alms-
 Lc. vi 30 giving has been introduced with the words from St Luke, 'To every
 one that asketh of thee give', it seems unnecessary to look further afield:
 'the commandment' is most naturally referred to a precept on giving
 which has just before been quoted. Some have taken it to mean our
 Lord's maxim recorded in Acts xx 35: 'It is blessed rather to give than
 to receive.' But this is somewhat far-fetched; though we may recognize
 the possibility that these words also (as well as Lc. vi 20 ff.) were in the
 author's mind when he wrote: 'Blessed . . . receiveth . . . giveth.'

It has been suggested that in our present passage 'the commandment' (ἡ ἐντολή) may actually refer to the Second Mandate (Ἐντολή) of Hermas, upon which the Didachist is here working: but that is not very probable. What, however, seems not improbable is that the Mandate or Commandment in question may have suggested to him the use of the phrase 'according to the commandment'.¹

The injunction to 'give according to the commandment' is found ^{xiii} 5, 7 twice in the latter part of the Didache. Whatever 'the commandment' in those passages may be, 'giving according to the commandment' cannot well have occurred independently to two writers; and so again we have an indication of unity of authorship in the two sections of the book.

The next words are again from Hermas: 'for he is guiltless'. We understand the statement of Hermas, 'he therefore that giveth is guiltless', because we know what he has said in defending indiscriminate giving, or 'giving simply' as he calls it. He realizes that such giving may have untoward consequences; but he entirely exonerates the giver and throws the whole responsibility upon the receiver. But as the words stand in the Didache they are hardly intelligible. The author has suggested no ground of possible responsibility on the part of the giver, that he should proceed to acquit him of it; for he has barely hinted, if at all, that giving should be indiscriminate. We are therefore wholly unprepared for his sudden announcement that the giver 'is guiltless'. He has borrowed the words mechanically from Hermas without regard to their setting.

But we must hear him further: 'Woe to him that receiveth; for if indeed a man receiveth having need, he shall be guiltless.' We have seen how, influenced by St Luke's Gospel and desiring to balance his own blessing on him that giveth, the author was led to enunciate the general maxim, 'Woe to him that receiveth.' But realizing that such an utterance embodies no generally accepted principle, he has perforce to qualify it. This he does by adapting some further words of Hermas. Hermas had said: 'for they that receive in distress shall not be brought into judgement'. The Didachist accordingly writes: 'for if a man receiveth having need, he shall be guiltless'—thus picking up again and applying now to the needy receiver the phrase in which Hermas exonerated the giver.

He continues: 'But he that hath no need shall give satisfaction (δώσει δίκην) why and wherefore he received; and being put in confinement he shall be examined concerning the deeds that he hath done.'

¹ [The last sentence of *Mand.* ii begins with the words φίλασσε οὖν τὴν ἐντολὴν ταύτην, and there are similar reminders at the end of some of the other Mandates.—R. H. C.]

The phrase which we have provisionally rendered 'give satisfaction' is compounded of two phrases which occur in Hermas, 'they shall render account (*ἀποδώσουσιν λόγον*) why they received and to what end', and 'they that receive in hypocrisy shall pay the penalty' (*τίσουσιν δίκην*).¹ To say, as the Didachist does, *δώσει δίκην*, 'he shall give penalty (in the sense of "give account") why and wherefore', may not be quite impossible Greek, but it is certainly clumsy.²

Mt. v 26 The Didachist goes back to the Sermon on the Mount to borrow from St Matthew a phrase about 'the uttermost farthing'; and then appends to his whole discussion a curious and unidentified quotation, which directly counters the enthusiastic teaching of Hermas as to giving unconditionally: 'But indeed concerning this it hath been said: Let thine alms sweat into thy hands (or "in thy hands"?), until thou know to whom thou givest.' This was the doctrine of Ecclesiasticus: 'If thou do good, know to whom thou doest it. . . . Do good to the godly, and thou shalt find recompense, if not from him, yet from the Most High.' But it is not the teaching of Hermas, who distinctly says, 'not doubting to whom thou shouldst give or not give'; nor is it the teaching of the Sermon on the Mount.

Eccles. xii I

This puzzling quotation is introduced by the formula *εἶρηται*, 'it hath been said', instead of the more usual *γέγραπται*, 'it hath been written'. With the introductory phrase as a whole we may compare Did. ix 5: 'for indeed concerning this the Lord hath said: Give not that which is holy to the dogs.' In the Greek the parallel is striking and shews that the same author is at work: in i 6 we have, *ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τούτου δὲ εἶρηται*; and in ix 5, *καὶ γὰρ περὶ τούτου εἶρηκεν*. The same verb is found in the closing words of the Didache, where a quotation from Zech. xiv 5 is introduced by 'it was said' (*ἐρρέθη*); and we shall remember that *ἐρρέθη* is thus used six times in the fifth chapter of St Matthew—'it was said to them of old time'. The only other express quotation which the Didachist makes is in xiv 5 (*αὕτη γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ ῥηθεῖσα ἐπὶ κυρίου*): 'For this (sacrifice) is that which was spoken of by the Lord: In every place and time', &c. (Mal. i 11, 14). With this formula compare Mt. iii 3: 'For this is he that was spoken of by the prophet Esaias' (*οὗτος γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ ῥηθεὶς διὰ Ἡσαίου τοῦ προφήτου*), where *ὁ ῥηθεὶς* refers to St John the Baptist.

xvi 6

The Didachist has begun with the scheme of the Two Ways, which

¹ Cf. Herm. *Sim.* ix 19, 3: *ἀλλὰ τίσουσιν δίκην τινά.*

² [On a separate slip of paper Dr Robinson has noted the occurrence of the phrase *δίδωμι δίκην* in the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* v 185 l. 20 (Theopompus, or Cratippus, *Hellenica*) and xi 14 ll. 30-1 (an unidentified fragment of Philo), in both cases apparently in the sense 'be punished'.—R. H. C.]

as coming from Barnabas he regards as Apostolic teaching. But he has quickly shewn his independence of a particular Apostle by making verbal changes, and by omitting all reference to angel or devil; then by adding a group of precepts, not worded exactly as in the Gospels, but such as Apostles might well have handed down to the Gentiles as their recollections of the great Sermon of our Lord. To these he has appended in a modified form precepts on Almsgiving derived from *Hermas*, whom he probably considered a writer of the Apostolic age, and who was undoubtedly quoted as 'Scripture' in certain circles. Then with a quotation which we cannot identify he has brought to a close this first section of the *Way of Life*, which he had introduced by the words: 'Now of these words the teaching is this.'

We pass on to a section which deals mainly with negative precepts. Here we have come back to the Epistle of Barnabas, the language of *Barn. xix 2* which is followed somewhat closely, though the order of the sayings is much altered and a good many minor insertions are made.

And the second commandment of the teaching (is this): Thou shalt ^{ii 1-3} do no murder, thou shalt not commit adultery, thou shalt not corrupt boys, thou shalt not commit fornication, thou shalt not steal, thou shalt not practise magic, thou shalt not use drugs,¹ thou shalt not murder a child by abortion nor kill it when it is born, thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's goods, thou shalt not forswear thyself, thou shalt not bear false witness, thou shalt not speak evil, thou shalt not bear a grudge.

Barnabas had begun his 'Way of Light' with a somewhat promiscuous set of precepts. Some of these the *Didachist* drops, such as: 'Thou shalt be simple (*ἀπλοῦς*) in heart and rich in spirit'; others he will embody later, some of them in a remodelled form. After ten of such precepts Barnabas had said: 'Thou shalt not commit fornication, *Barn. xix 4* thou shalt not commit adultery, thou shalt not corrupt boys.' It is at this point that the *Didachist* comes into general line with Barnabas again: for after his new heading 'the second command of the Teaching' he proceeds: 'Thou shalt not kill, thou shalt not commit adultery, thou shalt not corrupt boys.' But he himself prefers to make a much fuller catalogue, adding further precepts of the Ten Commandments. He also inserts 'Thou shalt not practise magic, thou shalt not use drugs', precepts which are not in Barnabas, but apparently are suggested by the *φαρμακεία, μαγεία* ('poisoning' or 'sorcery', and 'magic'), which occur *Barn. xx 1* later when Barnabas describes the 'Way of Darkness'. We may note that the *Didachist* has taken over the command 'thou shalt not forswear

¹ *Ὁὐ φαρμακεύσεις* might be rendered 'thou shalt not practise sorcery'; but the words which follow suggest rather the use of poisonous drugs. The very ambiguity of the prohibition constitutes it a link with those which precede and follow it.

Mt. v 33 thyself' (*οὐκ ἐπιορκήσεις*) from the Sermon on the Mount, the only place where it occurs.

ii 4-7 Thou shalt not be double-minded (*διγνώμων*) nor double-tongued, for the double tongue is a snare of death. Thy word shall not be false or empty, but filled with action. Thou shalt not be greedy of gain, nor a plunderer nor a hypocrite nor evil-disposed nor arrogant. Thou shalt not take evil counsel against thy neighbour. Thou shalt not hate any man, but some thou shalt reprove, and for some thou shalt pray, and some thou shalt love more than thine own soul.

The first sentence is, with modifications, from Barnabas (xix 6*b*). The next ('Thy word shall not. . .') may perhaps be regarded as a substitute for the difficult sentence 'Thy word shall not go forth in the uncleanness of some' (Barn. xix 4*b*, as amended above)¹: against 'empty words' we are warned in Eph. v 6 (*κενοῖς λόγοις*). Then we are with Barnabas again, but only for half a sentence: the actual words 'nor a plunderer nor a hypocrite nor evil-disposed nor arrogant' are not found in his Epistle; but they are represented by corresponding sins in the second part of the Two Ways. The Didachist, who aims at coordinating the list of sins in his Way of Death with the precepts in his Way of Life, has doubtless introduced the four precepts above in order to balance the four sins which he found already in Barn. xx 1. Then comes the precept against 'evil counsel' from Barn. xix 3.

Barn. xx
1, cf. Did.
v 1

Next we have a remarkable conglomerate. In Lev. xix 17*f*. we find the precepts: '*Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thy mind: thou shalt surely reprove thy neighbour, and not bear sin because of him. And thy hand shall not take vengeance, and thou shalt not be wroth with the children of thy people; and thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.*' In Jude 22*f*. we read, according to some early MSS: '*But some reprove when they dispute with you, and some save plucking them out of the fire, and on some have mercy with fear, hating even the garment spotted by the flesh.*' The Didachist has taken the precepts of Leviticus without the limitation to the 'brother' or 'neighbour'; but he seems to borrow his construction from the passage in Jude. Most noticeable however is the debt to Barnabas. Barnabas has said, using a phrase which he had already used twice before, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour *more than thine own soul*': but this sentiment would not suit the Didachist, who has already given the precept 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour *as thyself*'. Yet he knows and likes the phrase 'more than thine own soul', and so works it up into a new and less enthusiastic precept: '*Some thou shalt love more than thine own soul.*'²

¹ See *J.T.S.* xxxiv p. 133.

² For an interesting trace of this precept, see *Gesta apud Zenophilum* (Optat. Milev. ed. Ziwsa, app. p. 192). *Sabinus*, a Donatist bishop, wrote to Silvanus of

We now leave Barnabas again, and come to a passage which consists of the prohibition of five mortal sins—murder, adultery, idolatry, theft, and blasphemy. These prohibitions are constructed on a uniform and highly artificial plan, which presents several contrasts to all that has gone before. Each is introduced by the words ‘My child’ (τέκνον μου): then we have the use of the imperative ‘be not’ (μὴ γίνου), whereas the future ‘thou shalt not’ has been used hitherto. Further we are told that one sin ‘leadeth to’ some other; and this is repeated by saying ‘for of all these things’ certain others ‘are engendered’. Such is the framework. But we must read the whole passage.

My child, flee from all evil, and all that is like unto it. Be not angry, ^{iii 1-6} for anger leadeth to murder; nor jealous nor contentious nor wrathful: for of all these things murders are engendered.

My child, be not lustful, for lust leadeth to fornication; nor foul-speaking nor with uplifted eyes: for of all these things adulteries are engendered.

My child, be not a dealer in omens, since it leadeth to idolatry; nor an enchanter nor an astrologer nor a purifier, neither be willing to look at them: for of all these things idolatry is engendered.

My child, be not a liar, since lying leadeth to theft; nor avaricious nor vainglorious: for of all these things thefts are engendered.

My child, be not a murmurer, since it leadeth to blasphemy; nor self-willed nor a thinker of evil thoughts: for of all these things blasphemies are engendered.

This group of five prohibitions has no counterpart in Barnabas, and it is not like anything else in the whole of the Didache. Barnabas in his Epistle could not well have said ‘My child’; and the Didachist, if writing with a free hand, would hardly have thus suddenly introduced the pronoun of the first person singular. It is true that, having used the phrase ‘My child’ five times in this passage, he does use it again a few lines further down, where he is modifying a precept which he has taken over from Barnabas: but this need not cause us surprise; for, once it had come in, it could easily be used again. When we have realized how great a borrower the Didachist is, and how very few of his sentences

Cirta and entreated him to be reconciled to Nundinarius before the ensuing Easter, A.D. 305, so as to prevent scandal arising from apparent disagreement. He wrote also to Fortis, a brother bishop, to ask his influence for the same purpose. This letter was read at the enquiry under Zenophilus, in 320, into charges against Silvanus as a ‘traditor’ and peculator (D.C.B.): ‘Fratri Forti Sabinus in domino aeternam salutem. quae sit caritas iuxta omnes collegas certus sum, peculiariter tamen secundum dei voluntatem qui dixit *Quosdam diligo super animam meam*, Silvanum te coluisse certus sum. quare non dubitavi haec scripta ad te dare’, etc. The quotation is made loosely from memory, and the proposed emendation *dilige . . . tuam* seems unnecessary.

have thus far come entirely from his own pen, we are strongly inclined to think that he found this whole passage elsewhere, and transferred it with or without modification into his own book. Dr Taylor has insisted on the rabbinic character of the passage, which is in the spirit of the well-known injunction to 'make a hedge about the Law', i.e. to forbid lesser sins as a security against the greater sins which are of a similar nature. Some apocryphal book, Jewish or early Christian, may have been the source from which the Didachist was borrowing.

Now Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* i. 25, 100) says: 'This man is called by the Scripture a thief: it saith, Son (*υιέ*), be not a liar, for lying leadeth to theft.' This is perhaps the only passage in Clement of Alexandria in which it can be thought probable that he has used the Didache. Is it not more likely that the Scripture of which he speaks is some lost apocryphal book of which both he and the Didachist have made use? If this be so, we should no longer be faced with the difficulty that Clement quoted the Didache as Scripture on this one occasion, and yet never used it again; and that Clement's successor, Origen, should nowhere shew any knowledge at all of the existence of the Didache.¹

iii 7 f. But be meek, since the meek shall inherit the earth. Be long-suffering and pitiful and without malice, and quiet and kindly (*ἀγαθός*), and trembling at the words continually which thou hast heard.

It has been suggested that 'the meek shall inherit the earth' has been taken from Ps. xxxvii 11. This is of course possible; but, in view of what we have already seen of the Didachist's method, it is needless to go beyond the familiar words of the Sermon on the Mount.

The precept as a whole is an expansion of what Barnabas has said: 'Thou shalt be meek, thou shalt be quiet, thou shalt be trembling at the words which thou has heard.' This, as we saw, was based on Isa. lxvi 2. The Didachist greatly expands it; and we note that the imperative is used instead of the future, as the result of his use of the imperative in the preceding passage.

iii 9 f. Thou shalt not exalt thyself, nor give daring to thy soul. Thy soul shall not be joined to the lofty, but thou shalt have thy conversation with the just and humble. The visitations which befall thee thou shalt accept as good, knowing that nothing cometh to pass apart from God.

All this is from Barnabas (see *J.T.S.* xxxiv p. 133); but the awkward phrase 'from thy soul' (after the word 'joined') has been avoided.

¹ This section as a whole will come up for further discussion at a later point, when the precise meaning of the strange statement that Lying leads to Theft will demand consideration. [I do not know where this discussion was to have come, nor what was to have been the substance of it.—R. H. C.]

We pass on to a passage where the alterations of the language of Barnabas made by the Didachist are of a wider interest.

My child, him that speaketh unto thee the word of God thou shalt remember night and day, and shalt honour him as the Lord ; for whence-soever the Lordship is spoken of, there the Lord is. And thou shalt seek out daily the persons of the saints, that thou mayest find rest in their words. iv 1 f.

Here a wholly different turn is given to the striking exhortation which we found in Barnabas, who had said :

Thou shalt love as the apple of thine eye every one that speaketh unto thee the word of the Lord. Thou shalt remember the day of judgement night and day, and shalt seek out each day the persons of the saints, either labouring by word and going forth to exhort them and studying to save a soul by the word, or with thy hands shalt thou work for a ransom of thy sins. Barn. xix 9 f.

Barnabas is living in days of stress, and under a sense of approaching judgement. The Christian Society must hold together, and each member of it must strive to help the rest. Some can do this by words of counsel, others have but humbler functions. But none must be idle and unhelpful. Towards all who bring messages of divine encouragement the warmest affection should go forth.

But the Didachist knows of no stress and feels no emotion. By the simple process of omission the stress and the emotion disappear. In Barnabas the first sentences had run : 'Thou shalt love as the apple of thine eye every one that speaketh unto thee the word of the Lord. Thou shalt remember the day of judgement night and day.' Omit 'Thou shalt love as the apple of thine eye', and omit 'the day of judgement' : then join up the two sentences, and you have : 'Every one that speaketh unto thee the word of the Lord thou shalt remember night and day.' This is what the Didachist gives us, with a slight modification in the wording : he prefixes 'My child', which he has used five times already just before ; he omits 'every one', and changes 'the word of the Lord' into 'the word of God' : so that we now read : 'My child, him that speaketh unto thee the word of God thou shalt remember night and day.'

We can hardly doubt that in making this transformation he was guided by a recollection of Heb. xiii 7 : 'Remember your leaders, who spake unto you the word of God.' It is true that there the injunction was to cherish the memory of leaders who had passed away ; but the Didachist is attracted by the connexion between those who speak the word of God and the 'leaders' of the Church. Barnabas in his wider phrase, '*every one* that speaketh unto thee the word of the Lord', does not seem to have had any such limitation in his mind.

The Didachist then drops the enthusiastic phrase, 'Thou shalt love as the apple of thine eye', and takes 'Thou shalt remember night and day' out of its context, where it was appropriately used of 'the day of judgement', joining it incongruously enough with 'him that speaketh unto thee the word of God'. Then he compensates for his omissions by a strange insertion: 'and thou shalt honour him as the Lord: for whencesoever the Lordship is spoken of, there the Lord is'. The phrase 'as the Lord' recurs twice in the latter part of his work, in one case of a teacher, in the other of an Apostle (xi 2 and 4; 'receive him as the Lord', and 'he shall be received as the Lord'). The presence of the Lord where 'the Lordship is spoken of', or where the Lord's name is named, may be an eccentric paraphrase of the promise in the Gospel, 'Where two or three are gathered in my name, there am I' (Mt. xviii 20). Or it may have been suggested by the familiar words of Isaiah, 'Whilst thou art yet speaking he shall say, Lo, I am here'¹; or again by Ex. xx 24, 'In all places where I record my name (ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ οὐ ἐὰν ἐπινομάσω τὸ ὄνομά μου), I will come unto thee.'

In the remainder of the passage the Didachist distorts yet more grossly the sentiment of the original. The command now becomes 'to seek out daily the persons of the saints', not in order to help them, but to get the comfort of their words. The duty of warning and encouragement no longer rests on every member of the Society who is capable of thus helping others: it has passed over, as has been suggested above, to the professional teacher.² The final clause of Barnabas, 'or with thy hands shalt thou work for a ransom of thy sins', is omitted altogether, but will reappear as a separate precept a little lower down in a more obscure form (iv 6).

iv 3

Thou shalt not make division, but thou shalt pacify them that contend. Thou shalt judge justly. Thou shalt not respect persons to reprove for transgressions.

We observed in speaking of Barn. xix 12 that the word *εἰρηνεύσεις* should be rendered 'be at peace' or 'keep the peace', and not 'pacify'—the transitive use being rare and late.³ The Didachist however prefers the transitive use, and joins *εἰρηνεύσεις* with *τοὺς μαχομένους*,

¹ Isa. lviii 9: ἔτι λαλοῦντός σου ἔρει· ἴδου πάρεμι. This is quoted by Barnabas (iii 5).

² The word 'saints' retains in Barnabas its primitive meaning of the faithful or the brethren; and Hermas can even speak of the sins of the saints (*Vis.* i 1, 9). In the Didache it would seem to be narrowed to a particular class.

³ [See on Barn. xix 12 *J.T.S.* xxxiv p. 140, where it is noted that 'the verb *εἰρηνεύειν* is intransitive in the LXX and in the New Testament . . . whereas the transitive use, "to pacify", is comparatively rare and late'. It may be added that the verb occurs 15 times elsewhere in the Apost. Fathers, always in the intransitive sense: so also four times in Irenaeus's letter to Victor (*Euseb. H.E.* v 24). The

'thou shalt pacify them that contend'. He has thus no use for the *συναγωγών* ('bringing together') of Barnabas, so he drops it out. The other clauses are also taken from Barnabas.

Thou shalt not be of a double mind, whether it shall be or no. Be not ^{iv 4-8} (found) stretching out thy hands to receive, and drawing them in to give. If thou hast (ought) through (? the work of) thy hands, thou shalt give a ransom for thy sins.¹ Thou shalt not hesitate to give, nor murmur in giving; for thou shalt know who is the good recompenser of the reward. Thou shalt not turn away from him that is in need, but shalt share all things with thy brother, and shalt not say they are thine own; for if ye are sharers in that which is immortal, how much more in the mortal things?

Of these precepts we have spoken already; for with one exception they are all at various points in Barnabas (xix 5, 8-11). The exception is 'Thou shalt not turn away from him that is in need'. In the description of the Evil Way, however, we shall find in both writers the phrase 'turning away from him that is in need'.

Thou shalt not withdraw thine hand from thy son or from thy daughter; ^{iv 9-11} but from their youth up thou shalt teach (them) the fear of God. Thou shalt not command thy servant or handmaid, who set their hope on the same God, in thy bitterness, lest haply they should not fear the God that is over (you) both: for He cometh not to call with respect of persons, but to those whom the Spirit hath prepared. And ye servants shall be subject to your masters as to a type of God in shame and fear.

This is taken over with hardly the alteration of a word from Barnabas (xix 5, 7), and has been commented upon already (see *J.T.S.* xxxiv pp. 134, 136 f.).

Thou shalt hate all hypocrisy and everything that is not pleasing to ^{iv 12-14} the Lord. Thou shalt not forsake the commandments of the Lord, but thou shalt keep the things which thou hast received, neither adding nor taking away. In church thou shalt confess thy transgressions, and shalt not come to thy prayer with an evil conscience. This is the way of life.

Again all is from Barnabas (xix 2 f., 11 f.). In the last clause but one, however, the words 'in church' are an addition. It will be remembered that in Barnabas the command which preceded this requirement of public confession ended with the word *συναγωγών*, which the Didachist left out. Moreover, the word 'transgressions' is substituted for 'sins', even as in the later part of the book we read, in reference to the Sunday Eucharist, 'first confessing your transgressions'.²

The Way of Death is treated much more briefly, and Barnabas is very closely followed. But the Didachist has changed the order in the list active use appears in *Apost. Const.* ii 47, 1, where it seems to have been taken over from the Didascalia: *καὶ εἰρηνεύου . . . τοὺς διαφορομένους πρὸς ἀλλήλους.*—R. H. C.]

¹ See *J.T.S.* xxxiv pp. 133 f., on the corresponding clause in Barnabas.

² [On a separate slip I find a reference to *Jas.* v 16, *ἐξομολογήσθε ὄν ἀλλήλους τὰς ἁμαρτίας*, where there is the variant *τὰ παραπτώματα.*—R. H. C.]

of sins, and has added some sins to the list, thus bringing it more into line with his own presentation of the Way of Life. More will be said of this presently.

v 1, 2

But the way of death is this. First of all it is evil and full of curse: murders, adulteries, lusts, fornications, thefts, idolatries; witchcrafts, sorceries, plunderings, false witnessings, hypocrisies, double-heartedness, guile, arrogance, malice, audacity, covetousness, foul speech, jealousy, boldness, haughtiness, boasting: persecutors of good men, hating truth, loving a lie, not knowing the reward of righteousness, not cleaving to that which is good nor to righteous judgement, wakeful not for that which is good but for that which is evil; from whom meekness is far off and patience, loving vain things, pursuing a recompense, not pitying the poor man, not sorrowing for him that is oppressed by sorrow, not knowing Him that made them, murderers of children, destroyers of what God hath fashioned, turning away from him that hath need, oppressing him that is afflicted, advocates of rich men, unjust, judges of poor men, sinful with all manner of sins. May ye be delivered, children, from all these.

Barn.
xx 1 f.

Barnabas had written: 'But the way of the Black one is crooked and full of curse; for it is the way of death eternal with punishment, wherein are the things that destroy their souls.' We are not surprised to find that the Didachist has dropped the reference to eternal punishment. Barnabas goes on with a list of sins in the nominative case (as is natural in the context), and in the singular number. The Didachist has the same list enlarged and rearranged: he too uses the nominative case, though it is not accounted for by the context; but he prefers the plural number, which presently becomes so inappropriate that he is forced to use the singular. In the list of sinners he copies Barnabas with hardly any change at all. The closing sentence is his own and introduces once more and for the last time the directly personal form of address.

Brief as this section is, it has, as we shall see later,¹ a peculiar value for the light which on a detailed examination it throws on the literary relation between the Didache and the Epistle of Barnabas. We pass on now to the short passage which serves as the close of the Didachist's moral instruction, and by one of the anticipatory phrases to which he has accustomed us points the way to the outline of ecclesiastical institutions which forms the second part of his work.²

When with the striking word *πανθαμάρητοι*, at the close of the description of the 'Two Ways', the Didachist ceases to copy directly

¹ [Dr Robinson intended to include in the new edition of his book my paper on the second part of the 'Two Ways' (*J.T.S.* xxxiii, pp. 237 ff.)—R. H. C.]

² [As this last sentence shews that the link passage Did. vi was to have been discussed here in connexion with the 'Two Ways', the treatment of it found in Appendix A of Dr Robinson's book is now transferred to this point, but with some changes that he has indicated. The translation of the passage is his own.—R. H. C.]

from Barnabas, he adds, as we have seen, the brief sentence: 'May ye be delivered, children, from all these.' The words which follow form the transition from the first to the second part of the Teaching—from the *moralia* to the *ecclesiastica*—and they deserve to be studied with care.

See that no man make thee to err¹ from this way of the teaching: vi 1-3 otherwise he teacheth thee apart from God. For if thou canst bear the whole yoke of the Lord, thou shalt be perfect; but if thou canst not, what thou canst that do. But concerning food, bear what thou canst: but from meat sacrificed to idols by all means forbear; for it is a worship of dead gods.

Two passages of St Matthew's Gospel are ringing in his ears: 'Ye shall be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect' (v 48), and 'If thou wilt be perfect, go, sell all that thou hast, and give to the poor' (xix 21). On the first he has already played in his borrowings from the Sermon on the Mount: 'Turn to him also the other cheek, and thou shalt be perfect.'

We must begin by asking ourselves what Apostolic sanction could the writer have found for this doctrine of a higher and a lower observance, and for such precepts as 'Do what thou canst', 'Bear what thou canst'. We naturally think first of the Conference at Jerusalem, which refused to lay on the Gentiles 'a yoke' that even Jews found too heavy 'to bear', but yet insisted that they must abstain from 'meats offered to idols'. Here we discover much of the phraseology of our passage: ἐπιθεινὰ ζυγὸν ἐπὶ τὸν τράχηλον τῶν μαθητῶν, ὃν οὔτε οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν οὔτε ἡμεῖς ἰσχύσαμεν βαστάσαι, Acts xv 10; and in v. 28, ἀπέχεσθαι εἰδωλοθύτων, κτλ. Further, 'the yoke of the Lord' recalls 'My yoke' (Mt. xi 29).

But although the passage in the Acts is indubitably in the writer's mind (as it was in an earlier section, see above p. 229), it does not really sanction two possible courses, a higher and a lower; but rather makes a distinction between Jewish and Gentile converts in regard to certain requirements. Such a sanction is, however, found in St Paul's advice concerning virgins (περὶ δὲ τῶν παρθένων) in 1 Cor. vii 25-40, where we have a series of examples in which the Apostle offers two permissible courses, of which one in his judgement is the better and more consonant with Christian devotion. I should not venture to put St Paul's ὁ θέλει ποιεῖτω (1 Cor. vii 36) side by side with our author's ὁ δύνη, τοῦτο ποιεῖ, if it were not that there is strong reason for believing that considerable use has been made in the Didache of this part of the Corinthian Epistle.² The very next topic to which the Apostle turns is the question of idol-meats, and there is a curious coincidence, if nothing more, between the

¹ [Ἰδρα μὴ τίς σε πλανήσῃ. Cf. Mt. xxiv 4, Mk. xiii 5: βλέπετε μὴ τις ὑμᾶς πλανήσῃ.—R. H. C.]

² St Paul's argument is based on the transitoriness of the present world: παράγει γὰρ τὸ σχῆμα τοῦ κόσμου τούτου (1 Cor. vii 31): a thought which finds expression later in the Teaching (x 6), in the strange παρελθέτω ὁ κόσμος οὗτος.

language of the Didache here (*περὶ δὲ τῆς βρώσεως*) and 1 Cor. viii 4, *περὶ τῆς βρώσεως οὖν τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων, οἶδαμεν ὅτι οὐδὲν εἶδωλον ἐν κόσμῳ, κτλ.*

CODEX D AND CODEX A

It might seem fanciful enough to compare these two MSS, D (Cambridge, ed. F. H. Scrivener) and A (Bodleian Library, Auct. T. infra i 1), because, as is well known, their texts belong to very different families. Here, however, we are not concerned with the text as such, but with the exterior form in which the text is exhibited in these two MSS. A is written in short lines of 10-15 letters to the line, seldom more; the columns as usual vary slightly, some keeping more to an average of 10-12 letters to the line, others of 12-14 or 15. Codex D on the other hand is the oldest known example of a colometrical arrangement of the Gospel-text, which arrangement, however, in many places, gives way to an uncolometrical script with lines of more or less the same length. A closer inspection shews that such passages often enough are also interspersed with colometrical lines or with such lines at any rate the ends of which coincide with some pause in the sentence. For brevity's sake we shall call them as well sense-lines. It was when studying these colometrical lines that a remarkable relationship between the exterior form of Codex D and Codex A became evident. D begins and ends its lines so often in agreement with A that this fact cannot but arouse our attention.

One of the most striking passages is :

John xvi 15-22. ¹		
A (fol. 144 ^r 2 col.)	D	
15 Παντα οσα εχει ο π̄ηρ εμα εστιν ² δια Τουτο ειπον οτι εκ του εμου λαμ βανει και αναγ 16 γελει υμιν ² μικρο ¹ και ουκετι θεω ρειτε με και πα λιν μικρον και ο ψεσθε με ¹ ὅτι υπαγω προς τον πα ¹ :	και αναγγελει υμειν: παντα οσα εχει ο πατηρ εμα εστιν ² δια τουτο ειπον οτι εκ του εμου λαμβανει και αναγγελει υμειν μικρον ¹ και ουκετι θεωρειτε με και παλιν μικρον και οψεσθε με	+ + + +

¹ To indicate identical beginnings and endings of the lines vertical dashes are used. A cross at the end of a line marks it as a sense-line, or indicates that the end of the line coincides with a short pause within the sentence. The numbers attached to the lines in D indicate the number of A-lines contained in the D-line.